

The authors have carefully revised the manuscript and addressed all of the points in my first review. I found only a very small number of minor points to consider, but I think the manuscript is suitable for publication.

P1 L13: Consider slightly rewording clause from “improving mean squared errors (MSE) by up to 53% and 30% on median” to “improving mean squared errors (MSE) by 30% on average (median) and up to 53%”. I think “on median” sounds a bit unnatural.

P2 L21: Insert comma between “measurements” and “with”

P7 L18: Change “stations: A” to “stations: a”

P9: I accept the authors’ response about retaining the manuscript structure. The only further point to consider (possibly) is whether sections 4.1 and 4.2 could be split out into an “evaluation strategy” (or similar) section, with the remainder of “methods and results” (section 4.3 onwards) becoming its own section? This could perhaps help to separate things a little bit, but I think it is up to the authors (i.e. it is not a big issue).

P11 L5: Consider adjusting wording from “equivalent to a 30% reduction of error on median relative to...” to “equivalent to a median reduction of error of 30% relative to...”

P31 L25-28: Could this point be included instead in the first paragraph on P30 (specifically point “iv”, beginning on L9)? Otherwise the final paragraph of the discussion on P31 seems a little bit “tacked on”.